



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/682,279	08/13/2001	Cecil Earl Williams JR.	476901	4829

29169 7590 04/30/2002

CECIL E. WILLIAMS JR.
3171 LA MIRAGE DR.
LAUDERHILL, FL 33319

EXAMINER

TRIEU, VAN THANH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2632

DATE MAILED: 04/30/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/682,279

Applicant(s)

Cecil Williams

Examiner

Zelev

Group Art Unit

2600



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Krista Zelev, TC 2600 SPRE

(3) _____

(2) Mr. Cecil Williams, Applicant

(4) _____

Date of Interview 4/17/02; 4/23/02; 4/25/02

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: Not applicable

Identification of prior art discussed:

Not applicable

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant contacted the SPRE to ask general questions in regard to the prosecution of this application. SPRE Zelev gave general information concerning rejections under 35 USC 102 and 35 USC 103. It was further discussed that amendments made after final rejection are not entered as a matter of right. Mr. Williams commented that the amendments he made in the application were at the suggestion of the examiner. It was further discussed that Mr. Williams could request the finality of the outstanding Office action be withdrawn with arguments and/or evidence as to why he believes the finality of the action improper. Mr. Williams faxed copies of communications between him and the examiner of record as evidence that the amendments made by applicant were merely amendments suggested by the examiner. It was discussed that a complete response to the Final rejection is required in order that the case not go abandoned. Furthermore, applicant was advised that any determination on w/d of finality of the Office action of record would be determined by the examiner and/or his supervisor.

see attached copies of faxes submitted by applicant on 4/22/02.
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

KRISTA ZELEV
SPECIAL PROGRAM EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.